

Draft Memorandum

TO: Michael Vos, Municipal Planner
City of Rio Rancho, NM

FROM: Kevin Burnett, Willdan Financial Services
James Edison, Willdan Financial Services
Pat Walker, Pat Walker Consulting

DATE: April 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Review and Analysis of City of Rio Rancho Impact Fee Ordinance

Phase I of the Impact Fee Study Updates, involved a review and evaluation of the City of Rio Rancho (City)'s current impact fee ordinance and methodologies, analyze and/or assess the City's impact fee ordinance and schedules relative to other similar sized cities in the State of New Mexico and the Southwest, and identify recommended changes or modifications to the City's ordinance and methodologies in accordance with all state and local laws based on the review, evaluation, analysis and assessment.

In order to complete a review and comparison of the City's impact fee ordinance, Willdan Financial Services and Pat Walker Consulting (Willdan Team) reviewed impact fee enabling State Statutes for the States of Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico. We also reviewed the ordinances of the following 8 Cities with populations similar to that of Rio Rancho:

- City of Albuquerque, NM
- City of Avondale, AZ
- City of Boulder, CO
- City of Flagstaff, AZ
- City of Greeley, CO
- City of Las Cruces, NM
- City of Santa Fe, NM
- City of Yuma, AZ

The purpose of the review of the ordinances was to gain an understanding of the assessment of impact fees for each City and compare the approach of each City to the approach used by Rio Rancho to identify any refinements or changes that the City may want to consider as part of Phase II of the impact fee update study.

State Enabling Legislations

Our analysis and review began with a review of impact fee enabling legislation for the States of Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico. The specific statutes were:

Arizona:
ARS § 9-463.05

Colorado:
CRS §29-20-104.5 and §29-1-801804

Draft Memorandum

New Mexico:
NMS §5-8-1

The requirements to calculate, adopt and implement impact fees vary greatly between the 3 States. Of the 3 states, Colorado had the least restrictive and detailed requirements. Colorado legislation identifies that impact fees are permitted under the statute, but does not provide any specifics as to the timelines for hearing on adoptions, waiting periods, adoption of CIP, public outreach or the timeframe in which funds must be spent or projects to be constructed. There is the need for a rational nexus between the fee charged and the service received or burden placed on the system, but there are not any specific guidelines in the statute that we feel could be drawn upon in crafting changes to the City's ordinances.

The requirements for Arizona, which was crafted from the New Mexico and Texas impact fee legislations are the strictest of the legislations we reviewed, identifying the specific steps to be taken including the development of land use assumptions, an infrastructure improvement plan (IIP), the timing of public hearings for adoption of plans and the timeframe for the expenditure of impact fee revenues and the timeframe in which projects are to be completed. Both the legislations in Arizona and New Mexico dictate the types of facilities that can be constructed using impact fees. For example, in Arizona (swimming pools are permitted, aquatic facilities are not, recreational facilities up to 3,000 square feet are permitted) and requires that all classifications of development be assessed a fee. In New Mexico, libraries, community centers, and projects for economic development cannot use impact fee revenues. Also in Arizona park impact fees which are not traditionally assessed to non-residential development in other parts of the country are required to be assessed to all non-residential development.

The New Mexico legislation is more closely aligned with Arizona in terms of requirements. There is more direction in the adoption and assessment process than is found in Colorado, as New Mexico law requires the preparation and adoption of a capital improvement plan on which impact fees are based, but not as strict as the steps required in the State of Arizona.

The requirements outlined in the Arizona statutes are specific to Arizona, and therefore do not need to be implemented by the City, however there are some provisions that the City may want to consider to provide further public outreach and garner greater acceptance of the fees. The Arizona legislation has specific requirements for the adoption of fees, for example a 60 day posting notice for land use assumptions (LUA) and IIP followed by a waiting period of 75 days between formal adoption of fees and their effective date.

Key Differences between the State Statutes

The following represents the key differences we noted within the State Statutes of Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico as they relate to impact fees:

- New Mexico includes counties in their statute, Arizona has separate impact fee statute for counties, and Colorado has a separate statute for special districts, but does not distinguish between cities and counties.
- New Mexico allows a 3% administrative fee, Arizona does not and Colorado is silent on administrative fees.
- It appears based on our review, impact fees cannot be used for "Apparatus or Equipment" in New Mexico, but Arizona allows it. However in Definitions Section D New Mexico allows for "essential equipment" for Fire and Police buildings over \$10,000 and last over 10 years.
- Arizona requires a life expectancy of an asset of at least 3 years, for New Mexico it is 10 years, Colorado does not specify.

Draft Memorandum

- The capital plan can only go out 10 years for New Mexico and in Arizona, the statute is silent for Colorado.
- There is not a 60 day posting requirement for New Mexico but there is in Arizona for the LUA and IIP.
- New Mexico requires approval or disapproval of LUA & fees within 30 days of the public hearing, where in Arizona it must be at least 30 days after the public hearing. There are no such requirements in Colorado.
- New Mexico requires an advisory committee to review land use assumptions, the capital improvement plan and file an annual report on the progress of the capital improvements plan, where in Arizona you can choose either an advisory committee or biennial audit.
- New Mexico will waive impact fees for Affordable Housing Projects, Arizona does not.
- In New Mexico and Arizona, government projects must pay for impact fees, the statutes in Colorado are silent on this issue.
- New Mexico requires separate "Accounts" be established as in Arizona where separate funds need to be created to track impact fee revenues and expenditures. This is not required in Colorado.
- New Mexico and Arizona have refund provisions if construction projects actual costs come in 10% less than projected. Colorado is silent on refunds.

Methodologies

We did not find any requirements in any of State Statutes that dictated the specific methodology to be used in calculating the fees.

Our review of the impact fees assessed by the 8 Cities we analyzed used one of the four standard nationally recognized methodologies for calculating fees. The four methodologies were:

The buy-in method is a backward looking approach, which calculates costs based on the valuation of existing infrastructure that has excess capacity, or capacity that is available to serve future development.

The planned based and incremental cost methods are both forward looking methodologies. The plan based method uses planned projects (from a master planning document) that are identified as needed to serve future development. The incremental cost method also uses a projection of future infrastructure needs to meet new development demands, but is not directly tied to a master planning document.

The hybrid method is a combined backward and forward looking approach which bases fees on existing available capacity and additional infrastructure needs to meet demands from new growth.

Draft Memorandum

Review of Arizona Cities

The Willdan team reviewed the ordinances and fee assessment of three Arizona Cities: Avondale, Flagstaff and Yuma. Our review of each City is summarized below.

Avondale

The City of Avondale assesses new development the following impact fees:

- General Government
- Library
- Fire
- Police
- Parks
- Streets
- Water
- Wastewater

All of the fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water and sewer fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter.

Non-utility fees are assessed on a per dwelling unit basis for residential development and a per square foot of floor area basis for non-residential development. As discussed previously in the discussion on Arizona law, the parks fee is assessed to all development types including non-residential.

Flagstaff

The City of Flagstaff assesses new development the following impact fees:

- Fire
- Police
- Water (capacity fee)
- Wastewater (capacity fee)

All of the fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water and sewer fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter.

The non-utility fees are assessed on a per dwelling unit basis for residential development and a per square foot of floor area basis for non-residential development.

Draft Memorandum

Yuma

Yuma assesses new development the following impact fees:

- General Government
- Parks
- Fire
- Police
- Streets
- Water (capacity fee)
- Wastewater (capacity fee)

All of the fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water and sewer fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter. Sewer fees for larger than 1-inches are assessed a fee per gallon of required capacity.

The non-utility fees are assessed on a per dwelling unit basis for residential development and a per square foot of floor area basis for non-residential development.

Arizona Summary

Our review indicated that all of the assessments methodologies in Arizona are similar to one another without significant any differences in approach.

Review of Colorado Cities

The Willdan team reviewed the ordinances and fee assessment of two Colorado Cities: Boulder and Greeley. Our review of each City is summarized below.

Boulder

The City of Boulder assesses new development the following impact fees:

- Library
- Parks and recreation
- Human services
- Municipal facilities
- Police
- Fire
- Water (plant investment fee)
- Wastewater (plant investment fee)

All of the fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Draft Memorandum

Water fees vary by development type. Single family fees have two components. A fixed indoor fee constant across all development, plus an outdoor fee which is based on the square footage of irrigable area. Multifamily water fees are based on the number of bedroom units within the development. Non-residential fees are based on the estimated average winter consumption (AWC) for the development unit, and irrigation fees are based on the square footage of irrigable area.

Single family wastewater plant investment fees are set at a fixed fee for all development. Multifamily fees are assessed based on the number of bedrooms, and non-residential fees are based upon the anticipated AWC.

Non-utility impact fees for both single family and multifamily developments are based on square footage ranges (for example 900 or less, 901 – 1,000, 1,001 – 1,200 etc). The fee increases as the range of square footage increases. Non-residential developments are only assessed municipal facilities, police and fire non-utility impact fees. The fee is on a per square foot basis and varies depending upon the following development types:

- Retail/restaurant
- Business park
- Office
- Hospital
- School
- Mini-warehouse
- Warehousing
- Light industrial
- Nursing home (per bed)
- Day care (per student)
- Lodging (per room)

Greeley

The City of Greeley assesses new development the following impact fees:

- Parks
- Police
- Fire
- Water
- Wastewater

All of the fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water and sewer fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter. Multifamily utility impact fees are assessed at 50% of single family fees.

Non-utility fees are assessed on a per dwelling unit basis for residential developments. For non-residential developments the fees (parks fees were excluded) are assessed on a per 1,000 square foot basis to the following development classifications:

Draft Memorandum

- Retail/commercial
- Industrial
- Warehouse
- Public/institutional
- Oil & gas

Colorado Summary

The two Colorado Cities indicated greater variation in the assessment methodologies than was found in Arizona. Boulder took a more unique approach to the assessment of utility fees than Greeley or any of the Arizona Cities. The assessment approach for non-utility fees is similar across the two Colorado cities and the Arizona cities, however, both Boulder and Greeley had more expansive development classifications for purposes of fee assessments.

Review of New Mexico Cities

The Willdan team reviewed the ordinances and fee assessment of three New Mexico Cities: Albuquerque, Las Cruces and Santa Fe. Our review of each City is summarized below.

Albuquerque

The City of Albuquerque assesses new development the following impact fees:

- Storm drainage
- Public safety
- Parks
- Roadway
- Water (utility expansion fee)
- Wastewater (utility expansion fee)

The utility fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water and sewer fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter. Multifamily utility fees are based on the number of units with a fee developed as a percentage of the single family rate. Mobile home units are assessed a set fractional fee of a single family unit.

Non-utility impact fees are developed on a service area basis (by basin for storm drainage, east versus west for public safety, by service area for parks and service area for roadways). Fees are assessed on a per square foot basis with the exception of parks fees which are assessed on a per dwelling unit basis, but with higher fees for larger square footage ranges (for example 1,200 square feet, 2,000 square feet, etc).

Las Cruces

The City of Las Cruces assesses new development the following impact fees:

- Public safety

Draft Memorandum

- Water
- Wastewater

Las Cruces fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water and sewer fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter.

The non-utility public safety fee is assessed on a per dwelling unit basis for residential developments. For non-residential developments the public safety fee is assessed on a per 1,000 square foot basis to the following development classifications:

- Mini-warehouse
- Warehouse
- Hotel/motel (per room)
- Industrial
- Institutional
- Office
- Commercial/retail

Santa Fe

The City of Santa Fe assesses new development the following impact fees:

- Roads
- Parks
- Fire
- Police
- Water
- Wastewater

Las Cruces fees are assessed on a City wide basis (one service area for the entire City).

Water fees are based on a meter equivalent basis, with the fee for larger meters based on the capacity of larger meters to the capacity of a ¾-inch meter. Non-residential sewer fees are treated the same way as water, but single family fees are assessed based on square footage of living area.

Non-utility fees are assessed on a per dwelling unit and square footage basis for residential developments (larger square footage range developments pay a higher fee). For non-residential developments the fees are assessed on a per 1,000 square foot basis to the following development classifications:

- Retail/commercial
- Office
- Industrial
- Warehouse

Draft Memorandum

- Mini-warehouse
- Public/institutional

New Mexico Summary

The assessment approaches for utility impact fees is similar across the three New Mexico cities (with the exception of Santa Fe residential sewer fees) , but the non-utility fees vary significantly with respect to the types of development classifications and also a city-wide versus service area specific assessments.

Conclusions

The Willdan team's review of the City's approach to impact fee assessments as well as those of 8 other Cities in Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico indicated that the underlying principle of philosophy of assessing impact fees to new growth to offset the cost of providing required system capacity is consistent across all entities.

Rio Rancho utility impact fees are assessed on the basis of charging development with higher capacity demands a higher impact fee. This is done by assessing a higher fee for larger meters (larger meters have higher available capacity) and is consistent with the approach taken by most of the cities we reviewed and analyzed. The exception was Boulder which assesses a fee based on projected use. While the approach for Boulder is different than the other Cities the goal was the same, charge new growth a fee based on the anticipated capacity required to serve the new development.

Rio Rancho assesses non-utility impact fees on per dwelling unit basis for residential development and on a per 1,000 square feet basis for non-residential development. This is consistent with the approach taken by the 8 cities we reviewed. There were some minor differences whereby there are different fees per dwelling unit based on the size of the dwelling unit, and some cities charge on a per square foot basis rather than per 1,000 square foot basis, but the fundamentals were consistent.

Both Rio Rancho and Albuquerque took a phase-in approach to impact fees, where the maximum supportable fee level was achieved over a period of years rather than immediately. We find this to be a defensible approach, but it is worth noting that "lost" revenues from charging a lower than maximum supportable fee cannot be recouped from future development, and that the cost of infrastructure would need to be funded from a source other than impact fees.

A comparison of the fees assessed by each of the Cities reviewed can be found in Attachment A to this memorandum.

It is our opinion based on our review and analysis that the City's ordinance and methodology for assessment adheres to the state and local laws and is generally consistent with the assessment methodologies employed by other similar sized cities in Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico.

We have noted in our review that there are some differences in approaches to the fee assessment by other jurisdictions.

More specifically there were some differences within the Arizona Statute that the City may want to consider. The 60 day posting requirement prior to a public hearing and the 75 day waiting period after adoption of the fees prior to the fees becoming effective may help with public involvement and public acceptance of the fees. We do recognize these would cause delays in the assessment of fees and ultimately the generation of revenues to offset costs incurred to serve the new development. We noted that New Mexico law requires the annual auditing of revenues, expenses and

Draft Memorandum

progress of capital. The biennial audit in Arizona appears to be more in depth and requires an outside consultant to conduct the review. The City may want to consider adopting such a policy to increase transparency in the process.

We recognize these changes are more of a procedural nature rather than of a technical nature, however, without conducting a full impact fee study it is not possible to determine whether or not the City should adopt more technical revisions such as moving towards assessment schedules as employed by the other Cities we reviewed. As the Willdan Team works with City staff on Phase II of the study, we believe it will be important to revisit the assessment schedules of the other Southwestern Cities and ask the questions:

- Does this approach make sense for the City?
- Do we have the data to support this different methodology?
- What would the impact be from the change in methodology?
- Would the change in ordinance be in conflict with the New Mexico State Statute?

All of these questions are important to ask and should be thoroughly discussed with staff and decision makers as the process continues and new fees are being developed, to help identify the "right" approach for the City based on its specific circumstances and needs.

Fee Area	Arizona			Colorado		New Mexico			
	Avondale	Flagstaff	Yuma	Boulder	Greeley	Albuquerque	Las Cruces ⁽¹⁾	Santa Fe ⁽²⁾	Rio Rancho
General Government/Municipal Facilities									
SFR (per unit)	\$357	n/a	\$20	(3)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
MFR (per unit)	295	n/a	15	(4)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
All Other (per unit)	n/a	n/a	12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	0.37	n/a	0.013	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office (per sq ft)	0.10	n/a	0.022	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industrial (per sq ft)	0.06	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Light Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.015	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.006	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Manufacturing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.011	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hotel (per room)	n/a	n/a	3	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Library									
SFR (per unit)	179	n/a	n/a	(3)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
MFR (per unit)	148	n/a	n/a	(4)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	0.18	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office (per sq ft)	0.05	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industrial (per sq ft)	0.03	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fire									
SFR 0-3 bedrooms (per unit)	607	484	339	(3)	524	133	(1)	(2)	Captured Under Police
SFR 4+ bedrooms (per unit)	607	607	339	(3)	524	133	(1)	(2)	Captured Under Police
MFR (per unit)	501	474	267	(4)	393	73	(1)	(2)	Captured Under Police
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	550	115	(1)	n/a	n/a
All Other (per unit)	n/a	n/a	205	n/a	n/a	n/a	(1)	(2)	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	0.62	0.89	0.152	(5)	0.641	0.122	(1)	0.269	Captured Under Police
Office (per sq ft)	0.18	0.34	0.258	(5)	0.301	n/a	(1)	0.126	Captured Under Police
Industrial (per sq ft)	0.10	0.12	n/a	(5)	0.119	0.019	(1)	0.056	Captured Under Police
Light Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.171	(5)	n/a	n/a	(1)	n/a	n/a
Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.068	(5)	0.057	0.019	(1)	0.024	n/a
Mini-Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.022	n/a
Manufacturing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.132	(5)	n/a	n/a	(1)	n/a	n/a
Public/Institutional (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.229	0.076	(1)	0.113	n/a
Oil and Gas Well (per wellhead)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	261	n/a	(1)	n/a	n/a
Hotel (per room)	n/a	n/a	33	(5)	n/a	81	(1)	n/a	n/a

Fee Area	Arizona			Colorado		New Mexico			
	Avondale	Flagstaff	Yuma	Boulder	Greeley	Albuquerque	Las Cruces ⁽¹⁾	Santa Fe ⁽²⁾	Rio Rancho
Police/Public Safety									
SFR 0-3 bedrooms (per unit)	499	370	506	(3)	117	58	(1)	(2)	339
SFR 4+ bedrooms (per unit)	499	464	506	(3)	117	58	(1)	(2)	339
MFR (per unit)	412	362	399	(4)	88	32	(1)	(2)	225
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	123	50	(1)	n/a	n/a
All Other (per unit)	n/a	n/a	306	n/a	n/a	n/a	(1)	(2)	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	0.51	0.63	0.949	(5)	0.143	0.053	(1)	0.113	0.755
Office (per sq ft)	0.15	0.25	0.468	(5)	0.067	n/a	(1)	0.053	0.355
Industrial (per sq ft)	0.08	0.09	n/a	(5)	0.027	0.008	(1)	0.023	0.177
Light Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.296	(5)	n/a	n/a	(1)	n/a	n/a
Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.211	(5)	0.013	0.008	(1)	0.010	n/a
Mini-Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.009	n/a
Manufacturing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.162	(5)	n/a	n/a	(1)	n/a	n/a
Public/Institutional (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.051	0.033	(1)	0.048	n/a
Oil and Gas Well (per wellhead)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	58	n/a	(1)	n/a	n/a
Hotel (per room)	n/a	n/a	239	(5)	n/a	35	(1)	n/a	n/a
Parks									
SFR (per unit)	796	n/a	1,011	(3)	2,721	902	n/a	(2)	1,258
MFR (per unit)	658	n/a	797	(4)	2,041	487	n/a	(2)	832
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	244	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,857	776	n/a	n/a	n/a
All Other (per unit)	n/a	n/a	612	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(2)	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	0.82	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office (per sq ft)	0.24	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industrial (per sq ft)	0.13	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Open Space									
SFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	449	n/a	n/a	n/a
MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	242	n/a	n/a	n/a
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	121	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	386	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bikeways and Trails									
SFR (per unit)	796	n/a	n/a	(3)	377	49	n/a	n/a	32
MFR (per unit)	658	n/a	n/a	(4)	283	27	n/a	n/a	23
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	14	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	396	42	n/a	n/a	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.049
Office/Institutional (per sqft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.036
Industrial/Warehouse (per sqft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.023
Human Services									
SFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	(3)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	(4)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	(5)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Fee Area	Arizona			Colorado		New Mexico			
	Avondale	Flagstaff	Yuma	Boulder	Greeley	Albuquerque	Las Cruces ⁽¹⁾	Santa Fe ⁽²⁾	Rio Rancho
Storm Drainage									
SFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	341	(8)	n/a	n/a	4,465
MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	283	(8)	n/a	n/a	1,191
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	396	(8)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.094	(8)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Commercial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.094	(8)	n/a	n/a	1.786
Office/Institutional (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(8)	n/a	n/a	1.786
Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.094	(8)	n/a	n/a	1.786
Oil and Gas Well (per wellhead)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	188	(8)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Streets									
SFR (per unit)	2,945	n/a	696	n/a	3,645	1,399	n/a	(2)	2,691
MFR (per unit)	2,058	n/a	479	n/a	3,645	649	n/a	(2)	1,887
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	325	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,353	451	n/a	n/a	n/a
All Other (per unit)	n/a	n/a	363	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	(2)	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	3.66	n/a	0.804	n/a	4.825	1.409	n/a	4.006	4.196
Office (per sq ft)	1.58	n/a	0.436	n/a	4.266	n/a	n/a	2.402	3.094
Industrial (per sq ft)	1.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.476	0.588	n/a	1.856	1.955
Light Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.276	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.196	n/a	1.376	0.588	n/a	0.968	n/a
Mini-Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.375	n/a
Manufacturing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.151	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Public/Institutional (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.390	0.885	n/a	1.460	n/a
Oil and Gas Well (per wellhead)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,680	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hotel (per room)	n/a	n/a	223	n/a	n/a	928	n/a	n/a	n/a

Fee Area	Arizona			Colorado		New Mexico			
	Avondale	Flagstaff	Yuma	Boulder	Greeley	Albuquerque	Las Cruces ⁽¹⁾	Santa Fe ⁽²⁾	Rio Rancho
Total Non-Utility									
SFR 0-3 bedrooms (per unit)	6,179	854	2,572	footnote	7,725	2,990	footnote	footnote	8,785
SFR 4+ bedrooms (per unit)	6,179	1,071	2,572	footnote	7,725	2,990	footnote	footnote	8,785
MFR (per unit)	4,730	836	1,957	footnote	6,733	1,510	footnote	footnote	4,158
Micro MFR (per unit)	n/a	n/a	n/a	footnote	n/a	757	footnote	footnote	n/a
Mobile Home Park (per site)	n/a	n/a	n/a	footnote	6,675	1,820	footnote	footnote	n/a
All Other (per unit)	n/a	n/a	1,498	footnote	n/a	n/a	footnote	footnote	n/a
Retail/Commercial (per sq ft)	6.160	1.520	1.918	footnote	5.703	1.584	footnote	4.388	6.786
Office (per sq ft)	2.300	0.590	1.184	footnote	4.728	n/a	footnote	2.581	5.271
Industrial (per sq ft)	1.400	0.210	n/a	footnote	1.716	0.615	footnote	1.935	3.941
Light Industrial (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.655	footnote	n/a	n/a	footnote	n/a	n/a
Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.481	footnote	1.446	0.615	footnote	1.002	n/a
Mini-Warehousing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	footnote	n/a	n/a	footnote	0.406	n/a
Manufacturing (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	0.456	footnote	n/a	n/a	footnote	n/a	n/a
Public/Institutional (per sq ft)	n/a	n/a	n/a	footnote	2.670	0.994	footnote	1.621	n/a
Oil and Gas Well (per wellhead)	n/a	n/a	n/a	footnote	1,999	n/a	footnote	n/a	n/a
Hotel (per room)	n/a	n/a	498	footnote	n/a	1,044	footnote	n/a	n/a

Fee Area	Arizona			Colorado		New Mexico			
	Avondale	Flagstaff	Yuma	Boulder	Greeley	Albuquerque	Las Cruces ⁽¹⁾	Santa Fe ⁽²⁾	Rio Rancho
Water									
5/8"	n/a	n/a	5,203	(6)	n/a	2,690	2,420	2,013	3,264
3/4"	4,651	5,728	5,203	(6)	10,800	2,960	2,420	3,019	4,896
1"	7,767	9,566	8,690	(6)	18,100	4,933	6,050	5,032	8,160
1 1/2"	15,488	19,074	17,328	(6)	36,100	9,866	12,100	10,065	16,320
2"	24,790	30,530	27,735	(6)	57,750	15,789	19,360	16,104	26,112
3"	49,627	57,279	60,725	(6)	126,400	31,571	38,720	31,402	based on use
4"	77,533	95,484	104,070	(6)	216,650	49,332	60,500	50,325	based on use
6"	155,021	190,910	216,829	(6)	451,400	98,667	121,000	100,650	based on use
8"	n/a	305,468	416,278	(6)	Case by case	157,866	193,600	161,040	based on use
10"	n/a	439,157	n/a	(6)	Case by case	157,866	n/a	Case by case	based on use
Multi-Family	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,400	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wastewater								Non-Res	
5/8"	n/a	n/a	6,577	(7)	n/a	2,221	1,943	876.00	2,298
3/4"	6,781	3,723	6,577	(7)	5,450.00	2,221	1,943	876	3,447
1"	11,324	6,218	10,983	(7)	9,100	3,701	4,858	2,190	5,745
1 1/2"	22,580	12,399	10,983	(7)	18,150	7,399	9,715	4,380	11,490
2"	36,143	19,845	\$19.67 per gal.	(7)	29,100	11,839	15,544	7,008	18,384
3"	72,354	37,233	\$19.67 per gal.	(7)	63,700	23,735	31,088	14,016	based on use
4"	113,040	62,068	\$19.67 per gal.	(7)	109,100	37,935	48,575	21,900	based on use
6"	226,013	124,099	\$19.67 per gal.	(7)	227,350	75,875	97,150	43,800	based on use
8"	n/a	198,566	\$19.67 per gal.	(7)	Case by case	118,394	155,440	70,080	based on use
10"	n/a	285,468	n/a	(7)	Case by case	118,394	n/a	127,020	based on use
Multi-Family	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,725	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Utility									
5/8"	n/a	n/a	11,780	footnote	n/a	4,911	4,363	2,889	5,562
3/4"	11,432	9,451	11,780	footnote	16,250	5,181	4,363	3,895	8,343
1"	19,091	15,784	19,673	footnote	27,200	8,634	10,908	7,222	13,905
1 1/2"	38,068	31,473	28,311	footnote	54,250	17,265	21,815	14,445	27,810
2"	60,933	50,375	based on use	footnote	86,850	27,628	34,904	23,112	44,496
3"	121,981	94,512	based on use	footnote	190,100	55,306	69,808	45,418	based on use
4"	190,573	157,552	based on use	footnote	325,750	87,267	109,075	72,225	based on use
6"	381,034	315,009	based on use	footnote	678,750	174,542	218,150	144,450	based on use
8"	n/a	504,034	based on use	footnote	Case by case	276,260	349,040	231,120	based on use
10"	n/a	724,625	n/a	footnote	Case by case	276,260	n/a	Case by case	based on use
Multi-Family	n/a	n/a	n/a	footnote	8,125	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

(1) Las Cruces public safety fee includes, both police and fire costs and are assessed fees under the following schedule:

Residential (by square feet of living space)	Fee
900 or less	337
901 - 1,300	552
1,301 - 1,700	712
1,701 - 2,100	835
> 2,100	887
Non-Residential (per 1,000 square feet)	Fee
Mini-Warehouse	90
Warehouse	128
Hotel/Motel (per room)	202
Industrial	250
Institutional	366
Office	397
Commercial/Retail	1,014

(2) Santa Fe fee assesses fees under the following schedule:

Residential (by square feet of living space)	Roads	Parks	Fire	Police
1,500 or less	1,894	967	154	64
1,501 - 2,000	2,064	1,010	161	68
2,001 - 2,500	2,141	1,108	176	74
2,501 - 3,000	2,245	1,163	186	78
> 3,001	2,377	1,238	197	83
Accessory Dwelling	947	483	77	32
Multifamily	1,299	945	150	63
Residential (by square feet of living space)	Sewer			
1,500 or less	499			
1,501 - 2,000	735			
2,001 - 2,500	911			
2,501 - 3,000	1,052			
3,001 - 3,500	1,169			
3,501 - 4,000	1,269			
4,001 - 4,500	1,357			
> 4,501	1,435			
Multifamily (per unit)	561			
Mobile Home Park Pad	902			

(3) Boulder assesses Single family fees as follows:

Square Feet	Library	Parks	Human Services	Municipal Facilities	Police	Fire	Total
900 or less	\$222	\$1,519	\$71	\$136	\$142	\$101	\$2,191
901 - 1,000	257	1,763	82	157	165	117	2,541
1,001 - 1,100	288	1,974	93	175	186	130	2,846
1,101 - 1,200	316	2,169	102	193	203	143	3,126
1,201 - 1,300	342	2,347	111	209	220	157	3,386
1,301 - 1,400	366	2,512	118	223	236	166	3,621
1,401 - 1,500	390	2,668	125	237	249	176	3,845
1,501 - 1,600	410	2,813	133	252	263	187	4,058
1,601 - 1,700	429	2,951	139	262	276	195	4,252
1,701 - 1,800	451	3,077	144	273	288	204	4,437
1,801 - 1,900	467	3,198	151	285	300	213	4,614
1,901 - 2,000	483	3,313	157	295	310	220	4,778
2,001 - 2,100	499	3,421	161	304	319	226	4,930
2,101 - 2,200	515	3,526	166	314	332	234	5,087
2,201 - 2,300	529	3,625	170	321	340	240	5,225
2,301 - 2,400	544	3,722	175	333	350	246	5,370
2,401 - 2,500	556	3,813	180	340	357	254	5,500
2,501 - 2,600	570	3,900	185	348	364	259	5,626
2,601 - 2,700	581	3,984	189	355	373	264	5,746
2,701 - 2,800	594	4,066	192	361	381	270	5,864
2,801 - 2,900	605	5,145	195	368	389	275	6,977
2,901 - 3,000	616	4,221	198	375	396	281	6,087
3,001 - 3,100	626	4,292	201	383	402	286	6,190
3,101 - 3,200	638	4,365	205	389	409	291	6,297
3,201 - 3,300	648	4,433	209	396	416	295	6,397
3,301 - 3,400	658	4,501	213	401	422	300	6,495
3,401 - 3,500	666	4,566	216	407	427	303	6,585
3,501 - 3,600	676	4,629	219	413	432	307	6,676
3,601 - 3,700	685	4,690	221	417	438	310	6,762

(4) Boulder assesses Multifamily fees as follows:

Square Feet	Library	Parks	Human Services	Municipal Facilities	Police	Fire	Total
600 or less	\$234	\$1,604	\$74	\$142	\$151	\$174	\$2,379
601 - 700	284	1,942	92	171	183	211	2,883
701 - 800	325	2,236	105	198	209	243	3,316
801 - 900	363	2,494	118	222	234	272	3,703
901 - 1,000	398	2,724	128	242	256	297	4,045
1,001 - 1,100	427	2,933	139	261	275	319	4,354
1,101 - 1,200	457	3,123	146	278	293	341	4,638
1,201 - 1,300	482	3,299	155	294	308	360	4,898
1,301 - 1,400	504	3,462	163	308	324	377	5,138
1,401 - 1,500	527	3,614	169	320	339	396	5,365
1,501 - 1,600	548	3,754	176	335	352	410	5,575

(5) Boulder assesses non-residential fees as follows:

Development Type	Municipal Facilities	Police	Fire	Total
Retail /restaurant (per square foot)	\$0.15	\$0.50	\$0.40	\$1.05
Business park (per square foot)	0.17	0.11	0.10	0.38
Office (per square foot)	0.21	0.17	0.61	0.99
Hospital (per square foot)	0.18	0.16	0.52	0.86
School (per square foot)	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.25
Mini-warehouse (per square foot)	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
Warehousing (per square foot)	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.15
Light industrial (per square foot)	0.12	0.06	0.08	0.26
Nursing home (per bed)	20.19	22.44	54.98	97.61
Day care (per student)	7.85	20.20	24.68	52.73
Lodging (per bed)	24.68	53.85	68.44	146.97

(6) Boulder assesses water plant investment fees as follows:

Single Family Indoor:	\$12,188		
Single Family Outdoor:			
First 5,000 square feet (per sqft)	2.84		
Next 9,000 square feet (per sqft)	2.38		
Over 14,000 square feet (per sqft)	1.90		
Multifamily:			
1 or 2 Bedroom (per unit)	\$6,966		
3 bedroom (per unit)	8,707		
4 bedroom (per unit)	10,448		
5 or more bedrooms (per unit)	12,188		
Non-residential	25% of Class	50% of Class	85% of Class
Meter Size:	Avg AWC	Avg AWC	Avg AWC
3/4"	n/a	\$4,354	\$23,941
1"	6,094	15,671	72,897
1 1/2"	14,365	33,083	134,076
2"	26,554	70,086	281,645
> 2"	On a case by case basis		
Irrigation (per sq ft)	\$2.84		

(7) Boulder assesses sewer plant investment fees as follows:			
Single Family			\$4,754
Multifamily:			
1 or 2 Bedroom (per unit)			\$2,716
3 bedroom (per unit)			3,396
4 bedroom (per unit)			4,075
5 or more bedrooms (per unit)			4,754
Non-residential			
	25% of Class	50% of Class	85% of Class
Meter Size:	Avg AWC	Avg AWC	Avg AWC
3/4"	n/a	\$1,698	\$9,338
1"	2,377	6,113	28,469
1 1/2"	5,604	12,905	52,298
2"	10,358	27,337	109,858
> 2"	On a case by case basis		

(8) Albuquerque assesses fees under the following schedule:	
Service Area	Fee
Northwest (per impervious acre)	\$5,104
Southwest (per impervious acre)	5,104
Far Northeast (per impervious acre)	5,104
Central City (per impervious acre)	0
Tijeras (per impervious acre)	5,104